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Hunger and malnutrition are a global scourge. According to the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, 842 million people suffer from hunger globally, that is every eighth person on earth. Every sixth child in developing countries is malnourished.

But even if hunger has existed throughout the ages, it is not an insolvable problem. Past successes in fighting hunger have demonstrated that significant progress can be made with the concerted effort of the international community. One key lever for fighting global hunger is the promotion of sustainable agriculture through international development cooperation.

The German Ministry for International Cooperation and Development (BMZ) is pursuing this objective through its strategy for sustainable agriculture (3/2013) which focuses on two goals:

- Agriculture must reduce poverty and eradicate hunger
- Agriculture must protect natural resources and be climate neutral.

Since 2009, the international community, including the German government, has made repeated commitments to increase its financial investments in agriculture for food and nutrition security. These commitments include the G8 L'Aquila Food Security Initiative from 2009, the Camp David New Alliance on Food Security and Nutrition from 2012 and the Global Nutrition for Growth Compact in 2013. The new German government has reaffirmed this commitment in 2014 with its “Eine Welt ohne Hunger” initiative.

The upcoming German presidency of the G8 is an opportunity to lobby the German government for a stronger commitment to investments in agriculture for food and nutrition security and poverty reduction (AFNS) at G8 level. Within this context Welthungerhilfe is undertaking the advocacy project “Building Public and Political Will for Agriculture ODA in Germany”.

The goals of this project are:

1. Prominent inclusion of smallholder farmers' interests and site-specific agriculture for food and nutrition security in Germany’s G8 agenda in 2015
2. German policy decisions and resource allocation are to be taken based on evidence of the positive impact of agricultural development on food and nutrition security and poverty reduction
3. Greater transparency in German aid for agriculture for food and nutrition security (AFNS).

Within the context of this project Welthungerhilfe has commissioned a study to assess the German food security and rural development ODA flows, and more particularly those of the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) since 2005 and to compare them both to food security and rural development ODA flows internationally and to its own commitments. This study will also analyse the transparency of aid flows, particularly at partner country level.
The Approach of this Study

For the purpose of this study, it would be ideal to objectively identify all projects that contribute to food security and small scale farming and determine the financial volume of their contribution. For several reasons, this is not possible.

The attribution of project activities to food security and small scale agriculture is necessarily contentious. Scarcely does any development cooperation project serve only a single purpose and it is impossible to objectively attribute percentages of the overall project budget to separate purposes. This difficulty is further increased by the complexity of development where project activities in one sector have an impact on other sectors. Results, for example, in road construction, electrification, water and sanitation, education, health and governance projects can have a positive impact on food security and small scale agriculture and enhance positive results in projects more closely linked to food security and small scale agriculture. Small scale farmers are dependent, for example, on stable and effective governments and access to social services and to markets. Food security and support for small scale farmers is closely linked to a conducive environment and cannot be considered in isolation. The author of this study recognises this complexity and stresses the need for a multifaceted approach to fight hunger and food insecurity.

While a conducive environment is necessary, food security and a thriving agricultural sector based on small scale farmers cannot be assured by investing primarily in a conducing environment. A substantial part of the funding has to go directly to the production of food and strengthening small scale farmers.

Given the attribution challenge described above, the author of this study has decided to rely on the OECD purpose codes for its monitoring, since this is the most objective attribution system available and since it allows for international comparison. Instead of trying to assess projects that directly contribute to food security based on internal BMZ classifications that cannot be verified and that do not allow international comparisons, this study will focus on investments in core agricultural development and compare them to investments in related areas.

More specifically, this study will look at seven different project categories.

1. **Core Agricultural Development** – OECD sector code 311 without the purpose code 31162 (Industrial Crops/Export Crops).
2. **Fishing** – OECD sector code 313
3. **Forestry** – OECD sector code 312
4. **Industrial Crops/Export Crops** – OECD purpose code 31162
5. **Food Aid** – OECD purpose codes 52010 and 72040
6. **Environmental Protection** – OECD sector code 410 and purpose code 15250
7. **Rural Development** – OECD purpose code 43040
This classification is based on the assumption that projects in the first category (core agricultural development) and the second category (fishing) are most closely linked to the production of food by small scale farmers. The sixth category includes the removal of landmines (purpose code 15250) which, in some countries, is essential to make use of the soil. The removal of landmines is also included in the BMZ reporting on the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative.

The BMZ reporting strives to identify all projects in its portfolio related to food security and attribute them internally to either 50% or 100% of the project budget to the overall German funding of food security investments. This attribution is based on internal project information and is hard to assess from the outside. In addition, this attribution does not allow an objective comparison with other donor countries. For these reasons this study will rely exclusively on the OECD purpose codes. This method is also imperfect, given the general challenge of attributing projects to specific purposes as described above. Some projects that have a strong impact on food security, e.g. in the infrastructure sector, will be omitted, while other projects may be included that do not have a strong impact on food security.

As a consequence, the primary focus of this study is not food security as such, but the allocation of ODA funds to different categories of agricultural investments. It is the assumption of this study that the overall volume of agricultural ODA and its allocation to different categories and particularly the share of funding for core agricultural development has a direct link to food security.

This study is focussing exclusively on ODA that is either given as a grant, is grant-like or given as a loan. Equity investments are not considered, as equity investment is very unlikely to benefit smallholder farmers. In contrast to the AFSI reporting of the BMZ, this study will look at disbursements, not at commitments. The author of this study acknowledges that it is commitments that reflect the political will of the German government and that disbursements are contingent on the cooperation with partner countries. However, from a results perspective, it is disbursements that reflect how much support was actually provided, for example, for food security. For this reason, all figures in this report are disbursement figures.

ODA is provided by several German ministries and through different channels such as public implementing agencies, NGOs or multilateral organisations. In chapter 3, different layers of German ODA are considered; a) the overall German ODA, b) the ODA provided by the BMZ and c) BMZ ODA channeled through public sector agencies – primarily GIZ and KfW.

Since the primary source of data for this report is the OECD Creditor Reporting System which uses US dollar values, the currency used here is US dollars in current prices.

The second and third goals of this study relate to evidence of activities in food and agriculture activities and to the transparency of German aid in this sector. A second element of the study is the availability of information on aid flows in partner countries and highlighting information gaps.
Data Sources

2.1 OECD Creditor Reporting System
The key source of information is the Creditor Reporting System of the OECD. The Creditor Reporting System (CRS) constitutes a database of statistically validated data on all bilateral donors of OECD countries and all main multilateral donors, like the World Bank and the regional development banks. The Creditor Reporting System provides information about commitments and disbursement of ODA loans and grants for specific activities, country information, project title and description, detailed sector coding and additional policy markers that are relevant across several sectors such as Gender Equality, Environment and Climate Mitigation.

The strength of the CRS is the provision of standardised, statistically validated and internationally comparative data. The weaknesses of the CRS are that the data is not up-to-date and the lack of detail. Examples of the lack of detail are the lack of sub-national geographic information and the often very general project descriptions. The CRS uses a long list of different agricultural purposes such as agricultural water resources, agricultural inputs or agricultural research. There is also a purpose code for food security, but this purpose code is not used very frequently in German ODA reporting. The data does not allow, however, the identification of all activities that contribute specifically to food security. For most agricultural activities it is possible, but not certain, that they contribute to food security and small scale agriculture. In most cases the project descriptions provided by donors in the CRS are also too general and brief for users to assess whether an activity focuses on food security and small scale agriculture and if so, to what extent. The CRS does not allow for one activity to be attributed to more than one purpose code.

2.2 AFSI Report BMZ – Special Division „Eine Welt ohne Hunger“
The division within BMZ responsible for food security has its own reporting mechanism. Within the context of the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI), three annual reports (2010, 2011, 2012) were created that provided aggregate information about the funds invested in food security. Small scale agriculture, which is the second focus of this study, is not considered in the AFSI report of the BMZ. The report includes aggregate figures about the investments of BMZ in food security per region and different development instruments. It also includes a list of activities attributed 100% or 50% to food security, yet without the activity budget, the activity ID or the purpose codes. For this study, BMZ kindly provided this activity list for 2010-2012 with purpose codes. The AFSI report is based on the internal marking of projects as contributing to food security. It is written in German and is not public. It is, however, made available by the special division “Eine Welt ohne Hunger” on request in PDF format.

In the current version, the activities in the AFSI report are very hard to compare to the OECD CRS in order to identify which activities reported in the CRS are attributed to food security. The only point of comparison is the project title and the country. However, the project titles in CRS are in English and the project titles in the AFSI report are in German. Given the vast number of projects in the CRS, a manual comparison of projects is very time-consuming.
The comparison of the CRS data with the AFSI report shows that the AFSI report only considers a relatively small part of the activities listed under the relevant purpose codes as contributing to food security. The AFSI report also attributes some activities to food security which are not related to agriculture at all, for example, the removal of land mines, road construction, mining projects, the management of national parks, health activities, the implementation of climate protection protocols or the strengthening of environment ministries in partner countries. At times, the link between these activities and food security is clear from the project title, at times an indirect link to food security can be assumed, at times there is no obvious link to food security.

It is not possible to verify the attribution to food security of individual projects, since the only information available for such a verification are brief project titles and – if compared to the CRS – brief project descriptions which are often identical to the project title. The criteria for marking an activity as contributing to food security are not transparent. In addition, the attribution of an activity as contributing either 50% or 100% to food security is unspecific. Since the attribution of activities to food security is based on internal decisions and internal information, it is not possible to compare the investments of German ODA funds in food security to the investments of other OECD or G7 donors.

While the publication of the AFSI report is very appreciated and the BMZ special division “Eine Welt ohne Hunger” is very cooperative in providing additional information, the AFSI report only contributes partially to a transparency of investments in food security.

2.3 BMZ Data Reported in the Standard of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)

Within the context of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), the international community agreed on a data standard for ODA flows in 2011. This data standard is based on the OECD DAC CRS and is complementary to the CRS. There are several key differences between the CRS and the IATI data. It is created from the internal IT systems of donor agencies and ideally published at least quarterly to provide management data to all stakeholders. It is thus not statistically validated by the OECD.

On the positive side, IATI data is more detailed since it includes data fields that are not part of the CRS, such as sub-national geographic data, more detailed project descriptions and links to project documents. While the CRS only allows one purpose code to describe an activity, IATI allows attribution of percentages of an activity budget to different purpose codes. IATI is still a work in progress – most OECD donors have committed to publish their data in the IATI format by the end of 2015 and there are still many gaps in the IATI data. In the case of Germany, the IATI data is only available for BMZ, only for bilateral aid and only for the traditional OECD CRS data fields. Activities are not yet attributed to more than one purpose code.

The existing IATI data published in Excel format on the BMZ website was analysed for the purpose of this study. However, after consultation with the BMZ unit responsible for IATI publication and with the data quality unit of the IATI secretariat, it was decided to exclude IATI data for the time being because of errors in the data.
Description of the Data

For 2012, the most recent year for which validated data is available, the overall volume of German ODA disbursements was 9.65 billion US$ (without equity investment). 13.3% of this overall budget, 1.28 billion US$, was disbursed for the seven categories described in chapter 1 that are related to agriculture and food security. This part of German ODA will be called Food Security and Rural Development ODA in this report.

Out of the 1.28 billion US$, 1.02 billion US$ were provided by BMZ. This represents about 79.6% of German Food Security and Rural Development ODA. This part of German ODA will be called BMZ Food Security and Rural Development ODA in this study. Most of the funds (72%) provided by BMZ are channeled through the public sector – so primarily through the German development bank (KfW) and through the Gesellschaft für International Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). This subset of German ODA will be labelled BMZ Public Sector Food Security and Rural Development ODA. This chapter will describe the details for these different subsets of German ODA.

3.1 Agriculture and ODA by Purpose Category Across OECD DAC Donors

Spending in absolute numbers: Between 2005 and 2012 the USA has invested most funds in the seven categories monitored in this study among G8 countries, with the largest share going to food aid, followed by core agricultural development and environmental protection1.

1 For the time period covered, Russia was part of the G8, so the name G8 is used when referring to meetings and commitments before 2014. In the comparison of ODA flows, however, Russia is not included since it does not report its flows to the OECD DAC. Since Russia was excluded from the G8 in March 2014 the term G7 is used for current and future processes and events.
In 2012 the US spent 3,903 million US$ on the seven categories, followed by Japan with 1,230 million US$ and Germany with 1,289 million US$. For the cumulative value of the 8 year period USA ranks first, followed by Japan and France, with Germany ranking fourth and Italy ranking last.

### Table 1: In US$ million; Source: OECD CRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>3,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>7,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>7,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>13,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>6,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3,066</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>4,184</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>28,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis of ODA funding in the seven categories:

In 2012 these ODA flows are distributed across the seven categories as illustrated below. A significant share of all flows goes to food aid, to environment and to core agricultural development. Even without considering food aid, USA ranks first both for the 8 year period and for the last year reported in 2012.
The distribution of the G8 ODA flows related to food security and agriculture can be seen more clearly by considering relative values. Below, the distribution of ODA flows in the seven categories is illustrated in relative terms.

In comparison to other G8 countries, Germany and the UK have the lowest share of investments in core agricultural development in its overall investment in the seven categories in 2012 (20% and 16% respectively). The largest share of core agricultural development among G8 countries in 2012 is from Italy and Japan with about 37% each.

**Fig. 3: Distribution of Food Security and Rural Development ODA categories of G8 in 2012**

**Share of spending in 7 categories compared to overall ODA:** Over the eight-year period between 2005 and 2008, the G8 countries considered here had different trends in their allocation of ODA flows to agriculture related activities and food aid as demonstrated below in the illustration.

For Germany there has been a steady upward trend of allocating ODA to the 7 categories considered in this study, from about 6% of overall ODA in 2005 to nearly 13% in 2012. This upward trend is also apparent for most other G8 countries.
In past years, the G8 have spent on average less than 3% of their overall ODA on core agricultural development. In 2012 the average funding by the G8 countries of the seven sector categories under consideration in this study has been 12.3% of the overall ODA flows. In 2011 this percentage was at 13.4% of the overall ODA flows.

Among the seven sector categories assessed in this study, three G8 countries invest most funds in environmental activities (which includes in this assessment the clearing of land mines). On average, all G8 countries under consideration here have invested less than 4% of their overall ODA in core agricultural activities in the last 8 years and throughout this period Germany has remained well below this average. For 2012, over 6% of the overall German ODA was spent on the environmental sector, while less than half of that, 2.6% of the overall ODA, was spent on core agricultural activities. Likewise, France and the UK invest about twice as many funds in environmental projects than in core agricultural activities.
In some countries, food aid constitutes a considerable part of all ODA flows to the seven categories under consideration in this study. This is particularly true for the USA which has allocated between 48% and 90% of its Food Security and Rural Development ODA to food aid over the last eight years.

Between 2005 and 2012 the average share of food aid for all G8 donors was 23% of all agriculture related ODA. For the USA, the average share was 63% and for Germany it was 17%. For Germany, the share of food aid of all agriculture related ODA ranged between 12% in 2010 and 28% in 2009.

3.2 German ODA Related to Food Security and Agriculture for Different Funding Sources and Funding Channels

Fig. 7: Source of different Food Security and Rural Development ODA categories for 2012

Most of the German ODA is funded by the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). Minor parts of ODA are funded by the Foreign Office (FO), by federal ministries (FedMin), by the finance ministry (BMF) or by local governments (LG). This distribution of responsibilities also holds true for ODA in agriculture and food security. In six out of the seven categories considered in this study, BMZ is funding over 80% of the activities in 2012. Projects on environmental protection and forestry have a relatively large share of over 21% and 15% respectively of funding by sector ministries. Local governments, the ministry of finance and the Foreign Office play a very minor role, except in food aid, where the Foreign Office funds over 11% of the ODA flows going into the seven categories.

Looking at the same data from the perspective of the different ODA providers illustrates that these providers have different priorities in their allocation of ODA related to food security and agriculture. All public ODA providers except the federal governments prioritise activities in the field of environmental protection.
While this illustration demonstrates the weight given to environmental activities by all public ODA providers it has to be stressed that BMZ is the main provider of German ODA and the other agencies contribute only to a small extent to the overall volume of German ODA.

### 3.3 Allocation of BMZ Food Security and Rural Development ODA

Out of all BMZ funding in agricultural activities in 2012, most flows are channeled through the public sector, so primarily through the implementing GIZ and KfW. However, NGOs and civil society organisations also receive substantial ODA funding from BMZ to implement activities related to agriculture and food security.
As illustrated in the chart above, the high priority for activities promoting environmental protection is specific to the public sector and to unspecified activities. Other channels of ODA flows place more weight on core agricultural development (NGOs and public-private partnerships) and on food aid (multilateral cooperation). Again, it has to be stressed that, in quantitative terms, the volume of ODA channeled through the public sector is much more important than ODA channeled through NGOs or multilateral organisations. The financial volume of public private partnerships (PPP) is negligible.

3.4 Allocation of BMZ Public Sector Food Security and Rural Development ODA

The analysis in 4.2 concerns all German ODA and the numbers in 4.3 describe only ODA provided by BMZ. This section narrows the perspective down to Food Security and Rural Development ODA provided by BMZ through public sector channels (primarily KfW and GIZ). This part of German ODA is under the direct mandate of BMZ. This section looks at the distribution of this ODA to the seven categories of food security and rural development ODA and to different continents.

The chart above illustrates the distribution of BMZ public sector food security and rural development ODA from 2006 until 2012. The pattern described for German ODA and for BMZ flows generally is repeated in this subset of German ODA with funding of core agricultural activities taking up less than one third of all flows. Important other areas of funding are environmental protection and rural development.

Most activities related to food security and agriculture funded by BMZ through public sector channels are allocated to Africa with the financial volume going to Africa reaching 350 million US$ in 2011. The second largest share of these flows is invested in Asia, followed by America. For all regions the investments increased since 2005 and declined in 2011.
The distribution of different activities related to food security and agriculture differs between the continents. The aggregate numbers for 2005 – 2012 show that the share of core agricultural activities has been highest in Africa, rural development has been dominant in Asia and environmental activities have received most flows in America.

Over the eight-year period under consideration here, 39% of all BMZ food security and rural development ODA flows going to Africa were dedicated to core agricultural development. For Asia and America this share was 17% and 9% respectively.
3.5 The BMZ Report in its AFSI Commitments

According to its own report and based on its own criteria, BMZ spent additional ODA funds of about 1 billion US$ on food security over a period of three years. The table below summarises the German reporting to the G8 accountability report. The figures are based on commitments of the German government for the respective years. They exclude budget support and flows to non-governmental organisations, to EU aid budgets and to development funds of the international finance institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMZ ODA funds in Euros</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>99,885,000</td>
<td>164,100,00</td>
<td>124,265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sust. dev rural economies</td>
<td>96,390,000</td>
<td>114,840,000</td>
<td>100,027,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sust. mgt of natural resources</td>
<td>82,545,000</td>
<td>102,440,000</td>
<td>194,422,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>76,100,000</td>
<td>95,900,000</td>
<td>164,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>42,500,000</td>
<td>10,036,000</td>
<td>58,095,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement political instit. context</td>
<td>125,206,670</td>
<td>159,300,000</td>
<td>120,264,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
<td>45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>22,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>56,930,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>544,626,670</strong></td>
<td><strong>682,616,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>863,624,985</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below illustrates the relative weight of the eight different categories selected in the BMZ AFSI report. Core agricultural development is part of the AFSI funding. However, important shares of the flows are attributed to purpose codes for infrastructure, environmental activities and the improvement of the political institutional context. The table in Annex 7.4. gives a more detailed overview of the activities attributed to the AFSI commitment.
Both in 2010 and 2011 the improvement of the political institutional context represents over 20% of the overall AFSI funding. In contrast, the funding of core agricultural activities constituted 18% in 2010, 24% in 2011 and only 14% in 2012 of the overall funds attributed to AFSI.

As the detailed table of the BMZ AFSI report in the annex shows, the funds aggregated as promoting sustainable development of rural economies represent to a large extent activities to promote banking, financial services and other businesses. Like in the data analysis based on the CRS, activities linked to the sustainable management of natural resources constitute an important share of BMZ ODA.

As stated above, it is indisputable that food security and the support for smallholder farmers is a multidimensional undertaking and that e.g. environmental protection, infrastructure and banking services are essential in this undertaking. It is striking, however, that only about 20% of the funds attributed to the AFSI initiative are allocated to food production itself.
Chapter 4

Is Germany Meeting its Commitments?

4.1 Overview of German Commitments in Recent Years

There is a fairly long history of donor commitments for more development cooperation in general, for more financial support for Africa and for more investment in agriculture and food security. Already in 2002, leaders of G8 countries meeting in Kananaskis, Canada agreed to prioritise Africa in their cooperation².

Reach 0.51% of GNI by 2010 and 0.7% by 2015: All recent German governments including the current government promised to get closer to spending 0.7% of gross national income (GNI) on development cooperation. In 2005 EU member states had agreed that all countries should reach the 0.51% mark by 2010 and to reach the 0.7% mark by 2015. In 2005 at the G8 meeting in Gleneagles, Scotland this commitment was reinforced by a pledge of G8 leaders to increase aid to Africa by up to 25 billion US$ and to increase overall ODA spending to Least Developed Countries by 50 billion US$ by 2010. Germany pledged to spend 0.51% of its GNI by 2010³. The commitments of Gleneagles were reaffirmed at the G8 meetings in 2006 in St. Petersburg, Russia, in 2007 in Heiligendamm, Germany and in 2008 in Toyako, Japan.

Additional 1 billion US$ for food security: In 2009 at the G8 meeting in L’Aquila, seven of the G8 members made a new commitment focused specifically on food security and launched the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative. Russia did not participate in this initiative. This new commitment comprised alongside some qualitative aspects the pledge to mobilise over 22 billion US$ by 2012. Germany committed to providing 3 billion US$ to promote rural development and food security, with 1 billion US$ in addition to current spending levels for these sectors. This commitment was to be monitored on the basis of annual ODA commitments made by the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) through public sector channels. According to the unpublished BMZ reports on the implementation of the AFSI commitment and according to the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative Final Report from 2012, the financial components of the AFSI commitment were met by Germany and most other donors⁴.

Support small scale agriculture and food production: At the 2011 G8 meeting in Deauville, France no new commitments were made, but both the AFSI commitments and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) Summit in 2010 were reaffirmed⁵. The MDG Summit stressed the importance of supporting small scale agriculture and increasing food production to ensure food security.

---

² Information about this G8 meeting: www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/; accessed 29.7.2014
³ Information about the Gleneagles pledge: www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/africa.html; accessed 29.7.2014
⁴ For more details see: www.state.gov/s/globalfoodsecurity/rls/rpt/laquila/index.htm; accessed 24.7.2014.
⁵ The full document can be accessed here: www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/mdg%20outcome%20document.pdf; §70 (a,b,c,d,e)
Cooperation, up-scaling, alignment, mobilisation of private funding and support for smallholder farmers: One year later, the G8 meeting in Camp David, USA launched the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition. This alliance builds on the AFSI agreement and makes a commitment to continue to provide financial support for food security measures, without, however, making measurable quantitative commitments. The focus of the Camp David commitment is instead on better cooperation, up-scaling innovation, alignment with partner countries and mobilisation of private funding. In 2012, Germany and other G8 members also reaffirmed their commitment to food security at the G20 meeting in Los Cabos in Mexico and identified policy measures to be taken to fight hunger and improve food security. The G20 meeting did not include financial commitments. The individual commitments by Germany do not refer to the general commitments on food security. The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition stresses the importance of smallholder farmers, especially women, for food security, nutrition and a productive agricultural sector.

General support for Global Nutrition for Growth Compact: In 2013 in Lough Erne, UK food security and nutrition was again on the agenda of the G8, where its members confirmed their support for the Global Nutrition for Growth Compact. This compact signed by over 90 countries and organisations is strongly outcome oriented and sets outcome goals without clearly specifying how the goals are to be achieved. The compact does not include any measurable financial commitments.

One billion Euro annually for food security: The last specific commitment to cite in this list of commitments relevant for the German government is the special initiative of the BMZ, “A world without hunger”, which was announced early in 2014 by minister Dr. Gerd Müller. This special initiative comprises a number of concrete measures to promote food security, including an investment of 1 billion Euro annually. However, it is not clear which type of activities (which purpose codes) would be covered by this special initiative and to what extent additional funds will be made available for this purpose.

In summary, Germany has committed to promote food security by placing special emphasis on small scale farmers and women, by prioritising ODA flows to Africa and by increasing its overall financial cooperation as well as its financial support for food security.

---

6 Details of the commitment are documented in the fact sheet published by the White House of the US Government: www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2012/05/18/fact-sheet-g-8-action-food-security-and-nutrition; accessed 24.7.2014. The commitment of mobilising 1.2 US$ is not clearly defined with regard to who is to provide these funds and to what extent these are to be additional to current levels of funding.

7 The outcome document of the Los Cabos Meeting and the list of commitments by individual countries is here: www.g20.utoronto.ca/summits/2012loscabos.html; accessed 24.7.2014.


9 A German overview of this initiative has been published by the BMZ: www.bmz.de/de/zentrales_downloadarchiv/Presse/100Tage/100-Tage-Bilanz-EineWelt-ohne-Hunger.pdf, accessed 24.7.2014.
4.2 Is Germany Meeting its Commitments?

Germany continues to fail its repeated commitments to increase its ODA spending to 0.7% of its gross national income. While this commitment should have been met long ago, even the relatively recent commitment of 2005 has not been met and will not be met by 2015. General ODA spending, however, is closely linked to Germany’s ability to meet its sector specific commitments. It is not in the interest of integrated poverty eradication to shift resources from one sector to another in order to meet international commitments.

Likewise, Germany and the other G8 countries did not meet the collective Gleneagles commitment to increase aid to Africa and to Least Developed Countries\(^{10}\). In 2010, ODA flows by G8 members to Africa fell short by 15.2 billion US$ (in 2004 dollars) and by 18.2 billion US$ (in 2010 dollars). While there was an increase of overall ODA flows between 2005 and 2010, many OECD donors failed to reach the level of increase promised at Gleneagles. Germany did not come close to reaching its own commitment made in Gleneagles to reach the 0.51% of its GNI by 2010. This commitment was not reached either in 2011 or 2012.

Germany’s failure to increase its overall ODA according to its own commitments provides the backdrop for assessing Germany’s specific commitments to increase its support for food security and small scale agriculture. Increasing funds for food security will be to the detriment of other policy areas if no additional funds are made available.

As described in more detail above, these commitments are much harder to assess than the global ODA commitments. This difficulty concerns three areas:

- The commitments are not specific enough to enable an objective quantitative assessment of aid spending on food security and small scale agriculture. In addition, there are no internationally agreed common and specific criteria on how to attribute projects to food security and small scale agriculture. While the AFSI was specific in its monetary goals, there was no clear definition of which type of projects to include and which projects to exclude.

- The data collected on aid flows is not specific enough in terms of capturing the contribution of projects to different purposes. For example there is no purpose code or policy marker for food security and the OECD DAC CRS does not allow a partial attribution of projects to different purpose codes.

- The attribution of projects to different purposes cannot be verified based on the publicly available data.

Due to these challenges an objective monitoring of the implementation of commitments and an objective comparison among donor countries is not possible.

\(^{10}\) See more details under: http://iif.un.org/content/gleneagles-oda-commitment-africa; accessed 24.7.2014.
With regard to the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative, both the information from the OECD DAC CRS and from the BMZ itself suggest that Germany did substantially increase its ODA investment in projects related to food security and agriculture. According to its own report and based on its own criteria, BMZ spent additional ODA funds of around 1 billion US$ on food security between 2010 and 2012.

Based on the information available, it is not possible to verify to what extent the activities attributed to the AFSI commitment contribute substantially to food security and small scale agriculture. Given the fact that the AFSI did not specify criteria as to which activities can be attributed to food security, it is not possible to question the choice of activities, even if more detailed project descriptions were available. Given this lack of precision in the AFSI requirements, Germany and other G8 countries that made AFSI commitments attribute a very broad range of activities related to rural development to their AFSI commitments. To conclude that Germany has met its AFSI commitments for agriculture and food security is only possible if this broad definition is accepted and if activities ranging from infrastructure to the removal of mines to the promotion of international environmental agreements have a direct link to agriculture and food security.

Based on the BMZ reporting and based on the analysis of CRS data in chapter 3, it is clear that BMZ flows designated to agriculture in recent years have been primarily invested in activities promoting a conducive environment for food security and small scale farming. A particular emphasis of German ODA has been on environmental resource management. Only a relatively small share of BMZ ODA funds have been invested in core agricultural development. Investment in agricultural production is a key condition, though, to achieving food security. Germany is thus failing its commitment from the MDG summit to increase efforts in food production. The data available does not allow an assessment as to whether or not Germany has placed a special emphasis on promoting small scale farmers.

4.3 How much Should the G7 Invest in Agricultural Development?

At the World Summit for Food Security in 2009, FAO presented estimates according to which an ODA spending of 44 billion US$ per year in agriculture and rural infrastructure would be necessary to eradicate hunger by 2025. These figures are based on calculations that a total of 120 billion US$ of public investments are needed to eliminate hunger, of which the ODA share should be 44 billion USD, complemented by 76 billion US$ of government expenditures from the governments of developing countries. It should be highlighted that the FAO proceeds on the assumption that donors stick to their promise of spending 0.7% of GNI on ODA, which is vital in order for other sectors to also receive sufficient public investment.

---

Between 2005 and 2012, Germany had an average share of 7.3% of GDP of all high-income countries globally. Based on its economic potential, it is reasonable to expect that Germany should contribute 7.3% to the target of 44 billion US$ annually set by FAO. The professed commitment of the German government to eradicate hunger and to ensure food security should thus result in financial investments of about 3.25 billion US$ annually for agriculture and rural infrastructure. Even if all seven categories of ODA related to food security and rural development are taken into account, the current spending levels of Germany are far below the FAO target. Compared to the 1.2 billion US$ spent on the seven categories in 2012, Germany would need to increase its ODA in this area by 2.05 billion US$ to meet the FAO target.

Likewise, other G7 countries and, more generally, other high-income countries should substantially increase their ODA investments in agriculture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of High Income/OECD countries' total GDP (average value 2005 – 2012)</th>
<th>Proposed share of annual ODA investment in agriculture and rural infrastructure to reach 44 billion US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>11.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>33.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
German Food Security and Rural Development ODA in 3 Pilot Countries

Demands for more investment in food security and small scale agriculture are based on the assumption that such investments produce tangible results and contribute significantly to food security. While this assumption is well founded on theoretical research, concrete evidence for its pertinence is often too scant. Welthungerhilfe thus has an interest in tracking concrete investments in food security and small scale agriculture down to the spending level and collecting evidence on how they contribute to food security. Generally, this study finds that such tracking of financial flows is not possible at the moment.

To assess the traceability of financial flows this study selected three partner countries and collaborated with local Welthungerhilfe staff to identify possible sources of information on aid flows and aid spending. The three countries selected are Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and India. In discussions with local staff, several possible sources of data were considered: public aid management platforms, information from relevant government ministries, freedom of information requests and information by the German embassy.

Aid management platforms are databased tools used by finance ministries in partner countries which contain information on all projects and activities by donors in a given country. The information provided includes, as a minimum, the project title, the overall budget, the donor and the funds already disbursed. Additional information can be the sub-national geographic location and results indicators. Some aid management platforms are public, others are only accessible by the government. Examples of public aid management websites include Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Afghanistan, Kosovo, Moldova and Nepal12.

Generally, access to information on aid flows and more specifically on aid spending is very poor in all three countries. Both Burkina Faso and Ethiopia have aid management platforms which are not public and are not accessible for civil society representatives\textsuperscript{13}. The government of Burkina Faso provides reports on development cooperation for the public with very general data on disbursements up to 2011. The Aid Accounts and Audit Division of the Indian ministry of finance has some information available on its website, but this information is extremely hard to access, hard to understand, dispersed and very general\textsuperscript{14}.

Where information is not provided proactively, it could be an option for citizens or civil society or media representatives to request information from the relevant ministries or through Right to Information requests based on Freedom of Information acts (FOIA). In all three partner countries, obtaining information from ministries directly was not a feasible option for Welthungerhilfe staff. Such direct requests were considered to be extremely cumbersome and not promising. Burkina Faso and Ethiopia do not have FOI legislation in place, so formal requests were not an option either in these two countries. In the case of India, the formal request based on FOI legislation had not produced any results from the government of India.

Only in the case of Ethiopia did Welthungerhilfe staff obtain information from the German embassy after making an official request in person. The information obtained is a list of projects with a project number, project title, start date, project description, OECD DAC purpose code, commitment and disbursements. This information does not go beyond the information provided by the Creditor Reporting System of the OECD, so the embassy was not able to provide any additional information to that already available at the OECD.

In the three countries considered for this study, Welthungerhilfe staff were not able to obtain any information beyond the data provided by the OECD DAC Creditor reporting system. No local spending information was available.

Access to information in countries with public aid management platforms is only slightly better in that citizens can verify that aid flows reported by the OECD as disbursed are confirmed by national finance ministries as received. Aid management platforms have an added value, where they include non-governmental development cooperation and where they provide a national map of donor activities.

\textsuperscript{14} Website of the Ministry of Finance: http://aaad.gov.in/MainPageLinks/ClosingLoanYear.HTM
accessed 28.7.2014
In the context of the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) donors have committed to provide more detailed, more up-to-date and more comprehensive information about their activities. However, as mentioned above, the implementation of IATI is still underway and data quality so far is often not sufficient to use the data for analytical purposes. Most OECD DAC Donors have complied to provide IATI data by the end of 2015, but the current status of IATI implementation suggests that there will be considerable delay in the provision of detailed, comprehensive and up-to-date information by all DAC donors.

There are already efforts underway to make IATI data more easily accessible for the tracking of aid flows. The d-portal of the IATI secretariat is one example. But d-portal and similar tools are relatively new and will need to be further developed to allow an in-depth and user-friendly tracking of resources.

The assessment of access to information on food security and rural development ODA flows in three partner countries and current international efforts to increase access to aid information generally demonstrates that, until now, it is close to impossible for citizens and civil society organisations to track the flow of funds designated for food security and smallholder agriculture. For most partner countries, the only reliable information is aggregate numbers in national development reports and the OECD Creditor Reporting System. At partner country level it is not possible to access spending information at project level and in project results.
Conclusions

Increase German ODA to 0.7% of GNI: Eradicating hunger is a multidimensional process and increased investments in food security should not be at the expense of other important areas of development. Germany should cease to make hollow commitments of increasing its overall ODA and meet its repeated promises of reaching the 0.7% of GNI. An increase of ODA spending should go alongside increased efforts to make development cooperation more effective and to implement the commitments made within the context of the Paris-Accra-Busan agenda for aid effectiveness.

Increase ODA spending on food security and rural development: To eradicate hunger and to ensure food security the overall ODA spending on agriculture and rural development needs to be increased. To reach the target of 44 billion US$ annually, set by the FAO in 2009, all donors should significantly increase their ODA in this area. Given its economic potential, Germany should increase its ODA for food security and rural development by 2 billion US$ annually. This can only be achieved if Germany increases its overall ODA spending.

Increase investments in core agricultural development: In recent years, and particularly since 2009, Germany has increased its ODA for agriculture and food security. However, German food security and rural development ODA is focused primarily on sustainable management of environmental resources and other purposes that are indirectly linked to food security. In the whole period under consideration in this study, the investments in core agricultural development have been relatively low compared to the overall volume of food security and rural development ODA. While it is important to address food security in an integrated way and invest in rural economies and sustainable natural resource management generally, food production, particularly by smallholder farmers, should not be neglected. Germany should therefore increase its investment in core agricultural development.

Make quantifiable and time-bound commitments: In the past, many commitments by the German government have been hard to monitor. This was, for example, due to a lack of clear financial commitments, a lack of comparability among G8 countries or due to a lack of clear criteria for the attribution of activities to a certain purpose. At the upcoming G7 meeting in Germany, the G7 should make specific commitments based on time-bound, quantifiable and comparable indicators to eradicate hunger and promote sustainable small scale agriculture.

Increase transparency of internal monitoring mechanisms: In the wake of the AFSI commitment by the German government, BMZ produced an annual report describing its implementation of AFSI based on detailed numbers. This report was not published on the BMZ website but was freely shared with interested civil society organisations. BMZ should continue this very welcome practice and continue to share internal monitoring information. To increase transparency, BMZ should proactively publish such monitoring reports on its website. While the list of projects attributed to AFSI was useful, BMZ should make the relevant data sets used for internal monitoring available on its website in machine-readable formats (Excel).
Making ODA flows traceable: Citizens and civil society representatives in the North and the South are increasingly demanding to see evidence that investments in development cooperation produce results. One condition for citizens and civil society to be able to assess results is the ability to track ODA flows at national level. Until now it has been impossible for citizens and civil society in many countries to find out which donor is giving how much money to which local organisation for which purpose. In the three countries considered in more detail for this study, civil society organisations and citizens do not have access to up-to-date, comprehensive and detailed information about planned and implemented activities funded by ODA. The International Aid Transparency Initiative is supposed to provide this information. It includes, for example, more detailed project descriptions, allows for more than one purpose code and encourages the publication of sub-national geographical data. Until now Germany has not fully implemented the IATI data standard. The German IATI data is not yet of sufficient quality and does not contain sub-national geographic data and results information. Germany should increase its efforts to provide good quality IATI data on a quarterly basis. In addition, Germany should support the development of data tools to make IATI data accessible at partner country level.
# Annexes

## 7.1 Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFSI</td>
<td>L’Aquila Food Security Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSN</td>
<td>Agriculture for Food Security and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMF</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Finanzen – German Finance Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMZ</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Creditor Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedMin</td>
<td>Federal Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Foreign Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOIA</td>
<td>Freedom of Information Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Gesellschaft für internationale Zusammenarbeit – Implementing Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI</td>
<td>Gross National Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATI</td>
<td>International Aid Transparency Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KfW</td>
<td>Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau – German Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Local Government – German state governments (Landesregierung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 7.2 Resources

- **“L’Aquila” Joint Statement on Global Food Security**, [www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/LAquila_Joint_Statement_on_Global_Food_Security%5B1%5D,0.pdf](http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/LAquila_Joint_Statement_on_Global_Food_Security%5B1%5D,0.pdf), accessed 1.4.2014
- **Umsetzung der L’Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI) in der deutschen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit**, Berichtsjahre 2010 bis 2012, BMZ 314
7.3 OECD DAC Purpose Codes of the Seven Sub-Categories

Sub-Category 1: Core Agricultural Development
- 31110 Agricultural Policy and Administrative Management
- 31120 Agricultural Development
- 31130 Agricultural Land Resources
- 31140 Agricultural Water Resources
- 31150 Agricultural Inputs
- 31161 Food Crop Production
- 31163 Livestock
- 31164 Agrarian Reform
- 31165 Agricultural Alternative Development
- 31166 Agricultural Extension
- 31181 Agricultural Education/Training
- 31182 Agricultural Research
- 31191 Agricultural Services
- 31192 Plant and Post-harvest Protection and Pest Control
- 31193 Agricultural Financial Services
- 31194 Agricultural Cooperatives
- 31195 Livestock/Veterinary Services

Sub-Category 2: Fishing
- 31310 Fishing Policy and Administrative Management
- 31320 Fishery Development
- 31381 Fishery Education/Training
- 31382 Fishery Research
- 31391 Fishery Services

Sub-Category 3: Forestry
- 31210 Forestry Policy and Administrative Management
- 31220 Forestry Development
- 31261 Fuelwood/Charcoal
- 31281 Forestry Education/Training
- 31282 Forestry Research
- 31291 Forestry Services

Sub-Category 4: Industrial Crops/Export Crops
- 31162 Industrial Crops/Export Crops

Sub-Category 5: Food Aid
- 52010 Food Aid and Food Security
- 72040 Food Aid and Food Security Programmes

Sub-Category 6: Environmental Protection
- 41010 Environmental Policy and Administrative Management
- 41020 Biosphere Protection
- 41030 Bio-diversity
- 41050 Flood Prevention/Control
- 41081 Environmental Education/Training
- 41082 Environmental Research
- 15250 Removal of Landmines and Explosive Remnants of War

Sub-Category 7: Rural Development
- 43040 Rural Development
### 7.4 BMZ AFSI Report for 2010 – 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMZ AFSI Report</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 Agriculture</td>
<td>99,885,000</td>
<td>164,100,000</td>
<td>124,265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>99,885,000</td>
<td>164,100,000</td>
<td>124,265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Development of Rural Economies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312 Forestry</td>
<td>29,000,000</td>
<td>55,800,000</td>
<td>30,141,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 Fishing</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>1,190,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32161 Agro-Industries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32130 Small and Medium Sized Enterprises</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>7,700,000</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43050 Non-agric Alternative Dev</td>
<td>22,740,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Business and other Services</td>
<td>28,000,000</td>
<td>28,300,000</td>
<td>38,071,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 Mineral Resources and Mining</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>5,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>96,390,000</td>
<td>114,840,000</td>
<td>100,027,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Management of Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 General Environmental Protection</td>
<td>74,545,000</td>
<td>96,700,000</td>
<td>149,447,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14010 Water Sector Policy and Administrative Management</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>5,240,000</td>
<td>4,875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14015 Water Resources Conservation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>40,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>82,545,000</td>
<td>102,440,000</td>
<td>194,422,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14020 Water Supply and Sanitation – Large Systems</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>6,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14030 Basic Drinking Water Supply and Basic Sanitation</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>24,700,000</td>
<td>14,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14040 River Basins’ Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210 Transport and Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,500,000</td>
<td>14,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Energy Generation and Supply Including Biomass</td>
<td>46,100,000</td>
<td>46,200,000</td>
<td>128,370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>76,100,000</td>
<td>95,900,000</td>
<td>164,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Education</td>
<td>34,500,000</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>24,045,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>15,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Population Policies</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Other Social Infrastructure and Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16010 Social Welfare Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>42,500,000</td>
<td>10,036,000</td>
<td>58,095,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement of Political Institutional Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Government and Civil Society</td>
<td>82,650,000</td>
<td>58,700,000</td>
<td>60,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43040 Rural Development</td>
<td>42,556,670</td>
<td>100,600,000</td>
<td>59,564,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>125,206,670</td>
<td>159,300,000</td>
<td>120,264,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52010 Development Food Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
<td>45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
<td>45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73010</td>
<td>17,500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>22,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>56,930,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Total</strong></td>
<td>544,626,670</td>
<td>682,616,000</td>
<td>863,624,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>